



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,360	03/15/2007	Yee Kiat See	PA040025	9691
7590 Joseph S Tripoli Patent Operations Thomson Licensing Inc P O Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312			EXAMINER SIMONETTI, NICHOLAS J	
			ART UNIT 2187	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/08/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/561,360

Applicant(s)

SEE ET AL.

Examiner

NICHOLAS SIMONETTI

Art Unit

2187

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/19/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The

disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: "the medium" should be --the at least one removable medium--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 makes reference to "checking whether a characteristic feature of the at least one removable medium has changed". It is unclear as to what the applicant intends to reference this change against, as no initial state for the "characteristic feature" had been previously established.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garney (US Patent 5412798).

With regard to claim 1, Garney teaches a method for indicating the current status of a removable media device provided for being loaded with at least one removable medium, and being connected to a device for reading and/or writing AV storage media, having the steps of checking the type of user input upon occurrence of user input (Column 13 Line 57: "Card event service routine 1101 is activated when a hardware event is detected by the computer system upon the insertion or removal of a feature card in any socket provided by the computer system"), keeping the status of the removable media device if the type of user input is not related to the removable media device (Column 14 Line 35: "if the hardware event causing the activation of card event service routine 1101, is neither a card insertion event nor a card removal event, processing path 1113 is taken to processing block 1117 where the unidentified event is recorded. Processing then terminates at bubble 1131"), else checking whether a characteristic feature of the at least one removable medium has changed (See Figure 10: Card Insertion Processing. Column 14 Line 58: "Decision block 809 tests whether or not the device driver stub for the newly installed card still resides in the computer system RAM based on the device driver stub unique identification"), keeping the current status if the characteristic feature of the at least one removable medium has not changed (Column 14 Line 61: "If the stub still resides there, then the device driver stub executable code does not need to be loaded again"), and else updating the status (Column 14 Line 65: "If the stub is not still resident, processing path 812 is taken". See

Figure 10: Path 812 leading to Bubble 'B' and see also Figure 11: Bubble 'B' leading to Block 919 "Set command 680 to initialize. Set a card Insertion flag in stub data to indicate that a card is inserted in to a socket and accessible to computer system").

With regard to claim 2, Garney teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the characteristic feature is an identifier of the medium (Column 14 Line 58: "Decision block 809 tests whether or not the device driver stub for the newly installed card still resides in the computer system RAM based on the device driver stub unique identification". See also Figure 4: Device driver stub unique identification 407).

With regard to claim 5, Garney teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein identifiers of all removable media of a multiscard reader type media device are checked (Column 13 Line 21: "If any feature cards are currently installed in any of the available sockets of the computer system, the identity or address of the installed cards is obtained in processing block 711". See Figure 7: Block 711).

With regard to claim 6, Garney teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein, for a multiscard reader type media device the file structure of all inserted removable media is read and assembled to a single file structure (Column 21 Line 7: "memory area 1700 is depicted as it would appear after Card B, having device driver DD-B, was inserted into slot 2 of the computer system while card A remained inserted in Slot 1. There are two slots in the computer system, therefore device driver stub memory has been allocated to be the size of the two largest feature card device driver stubs. Therefore, in this example, memory area 1700 has been allocated to be five memory

units in size. In this way, memory area 1700 can contain DD-A and DD-B simultaneously". See Figure 17a-f).

With regard to claim 7, Garney teaches device for reading and/or writing AV storage media, the device being provided with a link for connecting a removable media device which itself is provided for being loaded with at least one removable medium (Figure 1: Removable feature card interface 108) wherein the device is provided with a controller (Figure 1: Processor 101) to perform the method according to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garney (US Patent 5412798) and further in view of Yamauchi et al. (US Patent 5661823).

With regard to claim 3, Garney teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Garney does not teach the user input types as described in claim 3. Yamauchi teaches wherein user input types related to the removable media device are one or more of input command to enter removable media device sub-menu (Column 50 Line 36: "The editing machine 600 is designed to receive operations of the exclusive keyboard 602a and remote control operation part 602i, display the menu of functions on the display part 602h of the exclusive keyboard 602a, and select a desired function from

this menu". Column 50 Line 50: "the CPU part 625 judges the type and quantity of devices connected to the editing machine 600 in step S161, and reduces possible functions on the basis of the result of judgment, and initializes necessary devices. Meanwhile, the result of judgment of connected devices is ... used in selection of menu". Column 51 Line 29: "when the display function is selected on the main menu, the screen of display 1 becomes as shown in FIG. 88"), input command to navigate within a removable media device sub-menu (Column 51 Line 44: "in the menu level 1, the display output can be specified. This display output is available in four types, menu, standard, processing, and division"), input command to access a removable medium (Column 51 Line 37: "when the memory card 1 is specified, for example, the screen of display 1 changes to level 2, menu mode name 'specification' as shown in FIG. 89"), and input command that generally is preceding an access to a removable medium (Column 52 Line 3: "in FIG. 90, when the retrieval is selected (step S168) on the main menu, the CPU part 625 changes the screen of display 1 to V2, the menu level to '1' and the menu mode name to 'retrieval' so as to specify the retrieval destination in step S169, and all input sources connected to the editing machine 600 (memory cards 1, 2, HDD, DDD) are displayed"). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method as disclosed by Garney with the user input types as taught by Yamauchi in order to allow for the system "to achieve multiple functions so as to sufficiently satisfy the versatile requests of users" (Yamauchi Column 1 Line 54).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garney (US Patent 5412798) and further in view of Edmondson (US Patent 3619585).

With regard to claim 4, Garney teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Garney does not teach the repeated read attempts in response to an error as described in claim 4. Edmondson teaches wherein checking whether a characteristic feature of the at least one removable medium has changed is performed repeatedly in case an error status has been detected (Abstract: "If an error is detected while reading data from a particular location in a memory, that same location is automatically reread a given number of times. If an error does not occur during the reread cycles, the program continues and the succeeding memory locations are read in normal sequence"). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method as disclosed by Garney with the repeated read attempts in response to an error as taught by Edmondson since "Manually reinterrogating the machine's ROM is uneconomical" and "It is more desirable to have the reinterrogation performed automatically" (Edmondson Column 1 Line 24).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS SIMONETTI whose telephone number is (571)270-7702. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30AM-5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571)272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. S./
Nicholas Simonetti
Examiner, Art Unit 2187
June 4, 2009

/Brian R. Peugh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2187